

# New England University Transportation Center



NE University Transportation Center  
77 Massachusetts Avenue, E40-279  
Cambridge, MA 02139  
Phone: 617-253-0753  
Fax: 617-258-7570  
web.mit.edu/utc

**Principal Investigator:** Nicholas E. Lownes  
**Title:** Assistant Professor  
**University:** University of Connecticut  
**Email:** nlownes@engr.uconn.edu  
**Phone:** (860)486-2717

**Co-Principal Investigator:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Title:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**University:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Email:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Phone:** \_\_\_\_\_

## Final Report

*Project Title:*

# The Influence of Real-time Rural Transit Tracking on Traveler Perception

**Project Number:**

UCNR22-13

**Project End Date:**

03/31/2013

**Submission Date:**

03/19/2013

The contents of this report reflect the views of the authors, who are responsible for the facts and the accuracy of the information presented herein. This document is disseminated under the sponsorship of the Department of Transportation, University Transportation Centers Program, in the interest of information exchange. The U.S. Government assumes no liability for the contents or the use thereof.

The New England University Transportation Center is a consortium of 8 universities funded by the U.S. Department of Transportation, University Transportation Centers Program. Members of the consortium are MIT, the University of Connecticut, University of Maine, University of Massachusetts, University of New Hampshire, University of Rhode Island, University of Vermont and Harvard University. MIT is the lead university.

## **Introduction**

Public transportation systems require accurate and reliable information as part of their day-to-day operations and are increasingly engaging their customers through a variety of online services and smart phone applications, such as real-time vehicle tracking. This technology requires a significant investment on the part of the operators. The objective of this study was to evaluate whether transit agencies can expect to reap benefits from their investments in technology. Zhang et al. (2008) examine this question using ridership characteristics and found that bus tracking technology does not necessarily lead to increased ridership, but does lead to improved perceptions of nighttime safety and overall satisfaction with the transit service. This study examines additional attitudes towards a bus service that recently deployed a real-time tracking technology. The University of Connecticut bus system was utilized in this study.

## **Background**

There are many studies outside of the transportation literature that investigate the perceived value of technologies and service (e.g., Kuo et al. 2009). Studies of previous generations of real-time bus arrival information have shown significant, positive impacts on the attitude toward the service, perception of reliability and ridership. Riders tend to value the micro-attributes of transit, the comfort, reliability, and quality of service. Henscher et al. (2003) estimate the impacts of service information at the bus stop – in this case, a system map and schedule. Interestingly, the study found that presence of a timetable and map did not significantly improve the perceived service quality – though the lack of these had a significant negative impact.

## **Survey Development**

The survey instrument was constructed to make possible the estimation of the impact of enhanced, real-time information on the attitudes and perceptions of value of transit service. Perceived quality was measured on a 7-point Likert scale, using question format consistent with studies of perceived value. A statement was presented to the respondent and their level of agreement with the statement requested from “1 = strongly disagree” to “7 = strongly agree”. The survey was constructed using open-source software and access to the survey was made available through desktop and laptop computers in addition to mobile devices. 281 valid responses were collected from University of Connecticut students, staff and faculty.

## **Results**

The results of basic statistical analysis on the survey responses are shown below. The comparison of means below classifies respondents as “tracker users” and “tracker non-users”. Demographic and socioeconomic variables are not controlled in this analysis; it is a direct comparison of means using a two-sample *t*-test assuming unequal variance.

## **Discussion**

The darkly shaded cells in the table below indicate a difference in means significant at the 5% level. A single-tailed test was conducted. The results agree with those of Zhang et al. (2008) in that overall satisfaction is higher for real-time tracker users. Furthermore, real-time tracker users tend to have a more favorable attitude toward many of the aspects of transit service, some of which have nothing to do with information availability. This suggests that the benefits of technology, such as real-time tracking, may spill over beyond the elements of the service one

would expect an improved attitude towards (such as on-time performance) to areas that have no logical connection (the cleanliness of buses).

<i>t</i> - Test: Two-Sample Assuming Unequal Variances					
	<b>Tracker user?</b>			<b>Tracker user?</b>	
	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>		<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>
	<b>Observations</b>			<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>
	94	187			
<i>Overall I am satisfied with the bus system</i>			<i>Route/schedule information is easy to use</i>		
Mean	4.27	5.21	Mean	4.73	5.82
P( $T \leq t$ ) one-tail	0.000		P( $T \leq t$ ) one-tail	0.000	
<i>The buses arrive on-time</i>			<i>Adequate shelter is provided at the bus stops</i>		
Mean	4.00	4.30	Mean	3.89	4.19
P( $T \leq t$ ) one-tail	0.066		P( $T \leq t$ ) one-tail	0.084	
<i>Route/schedule information is easily accessible</i>			<i>Buses begin to run early enough in the morning</i>		
Mean	4.50	5.70	Mean	5.18	5.90
P( $T \leq t$ ) one-tail	0.000		P( $T \leq t$ ) one-tail	0.000	
<i>Bus stops are located conveniently</i>			<i>Buses continue to run late enough at night</i>		
Mean	4.64	5.35	Mean	4.74	4.68
P( $T \leq t$ ) one-tail	0.000		P( $T \leq t$ ) one-tail	0.397	
<i>The bus travels where I need to go</i>			<i>Buses run frequently enough on the weekend</i>		
Mean	4.51	5.45	Mean	3.62	2.95
P( $T \leq t$ ) one-tail	0.000		P( $T \leq t$ ) one-tail	0.001	
<i>The Buses are clean</i>					
Mean	5.38	5.90			
P( $T \leq t$ ) one-tail	0.001				

This could be a product of an overall improved perception of the transit system by technology users that impacts most aspects of the service, even if there is no rational connection. This study was conducted using a university transit system and the results above do not control for demographic or socioeconomic factors: generalizing to other systems will require a more robust data set and additional analysis.

## References

- Hensher et al. (2003). Service quality—developing a service quality index in the provision of commercial bus contracts. *Trans. Res. A*, 37, 499–517.
- Kuo, et al. (2009) The relationships among service quality, perceived value, customer satisfaction, and post-purchase intention in mobile value-added services. *Computers in Human Behavior*, doi:10.1016/j.chb.2009.03.003.
- Zhang, Shen and Clifton (2008) Examination of Traveler Responses to Real-Time Information About Bus Arrivals Using Panel Data, *Transportation Research Record*, 2082:107-115.